



**STOCKWOOD, HENGROVE & WHITCHURCH PARK  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARTNERSHIP  
15<sup>TH</sup> JUNE 2016**

**Title:** Local Traffic Schemes & Minor Works 2016/17

**Report author:** Ariaaf Hussain – Neighbourhood Partnership Coordinator

**RECOMMENDATION**

To confirm the allocation of the 2016/17 Highways budget allocation

Budget (overall)  
Traffic Scheme  
Minor Signs and lines  
Minor works

To note potential future traffic schemes (subject to discussions with Highways Team)

To note the Minor Works requests

1. The Partnership has £17,143 to allocate towards minor lines and signs, a Local Traffic Scheme and Minor Works for 2016/17
2. Previously the Partnership has approved £1,500 for minor lines and signs (to be spent at officer's discretion) and £3,000 for minor works, with the remaining to be allocated to a local Traffic Scheme
3. In March 2016 the Partnership allocated the budget as follows for 2016/17:
  - Minor signs and lines - £1,643

- Local Traffic Scheme - £15,500
- Minor Works – to be allocated from the Neighbourhood Budget as schemes are identified through reports to the Partnership

**4.** The Partnership is required to identify a traffic scheme for delivery by highway for 2016/17

- The partnership can only take forward one scheme for progress per financial year
- It can identify additional schemes for future years
- There is no restriction on the number of Minor Works that the Partnership can suggest. The issue would be the budget available for delivery of the Minor Works requests

**5.** Members of the Partnership met in October 2015 to discuss the Highways issues that have been raised and identified on the Traffic Choices web portal.

- The Partnership has identified for recommendation future traffic schemes in the tables below (depending on budget availability)
- The Partnership with the Highways Team has identified potential Minor Works raised with in Traffic Choices website up to November 2015.
- Meetings have been held between the Neighbourhood Partnership Coordinator and the Highways Team to discuss the future Traffic Schemes.
- The table below provides the initial comments from the Highway Team

**6.** Minor works are measures that do not need significant design, consultation or legal work. Examples could include footway bollards, coloured surfacing, benches or dropped kerbs to aid pedestrian access. All requests will be reviewed by highway officers and reported for approval at the next Neighbourhood Partnership meeting.



## Future Traffic Schemes

No	Traffic Choices Ref No:	Request	Comments
1	403	Request for parking restrictions at Selden Rd	Possible Scheme
2	409	Request for pedestrian crossing on Cadogan Rd	Would be difficult to site a crossing
3	808	Request for Parking restrictions at Mile Walk, Hengrove	Not a public footpath, very short DYs – what is the issue to be addressed
4	928	A37 Wells Rd - request for Pedestrian Crossing Signal	Costly scheme over £50k
5	994	Shared cycle/foot path - Sturminster Road	Potential to be part of Strategic Cycle Network
6	395	Parking issues and road safety concerns at Sturminster Rd	Full Scheme with 398
7	398	Request for yellow lines to be extended at Tibbott Walk	Full Scheme with 395
8	415	Vehicles parking on the Green at Cowling Drive	Not appropriate as a local traffic scheme
9	404	Request for adjustments to pedestrian island at Airport Rd	Potential to be done as part of Airport Road

			Cycle scheme – part of the Strategic Route Scheme in 2016/17
<b>10</b>	400	Request for yellow lines to be shortened at Hengrove Ave	To be rectified by Highways – not a traffic scheme
<b>11</b>	814	Request for DYLS at Cottle Rd (opposite driveways)	Minor signs & lines depending on clarification
<b>12</b>	1018	Request for DYLS - Long Eaton Drive	No accidents at this site – no scheme to be progressed

#### Schemes added from Minor Traffic Works to potential Full Schemes

<b>1</b>	397	Pedestrian improvements requested at Clatworthy Dr / Tarnock Ave	All these three issues are within the same locality – therefore potential as one scheme
<b>4</b>	989 (linked to 397)	Short/Missing footpath at Tarnock/Clatworthy Road	
<b>5</b>	992 (linked to 397 & 989)	Request for Give Way sign at Clatworthy/Tarnock Junction	
<b>3</b>	920	Hengrove Ave (access lane) - request for DYLS	

#### Issues from Existing Traffic Schemes

	Walsh Ave	A number of issues have been raised including the lack of DYLS at the speed bumps etc. Concerns that the schemes has not been	
--	-----------	---	--

		implemented as per the design and issues that have arisen since the scheme has been delivered.	
	Stockwood Lane	Implementation of further works as identified through the consultation process	
<b>Scheme from Dundry View NP now in Hengrove &amp; Whitchurch Park ward</b>			
	Totshill Drive/Knightsbridge Park	Improve parking facilities - £10k allocated by Dundry View NP to take this forward	
	Footpaths between Whitchurch Lane, East Dundry Road, roads perpendicular to Court Farm Road (Woodmarsh and Yewcroft)	Alternative scheme to the one above (as a second priority if the above scheme cannot be delivered)	

### Requests for Minor Works

No	Traffic Choices Ref No:	Request
2	411	Request for dropped kerbs at Tibbot Rd and Craydon Rd
6	993	Request for barrier at St Bernadette Primary School, Gladstone Road
7	1004	Dropped kerb request - Stockwood

### Requests for Minor Works 2015/16

No	Location	Request	Approx. cost	Progress
----	----------	---------	--------------	----------

---

1	Petherton Rd, Hengrove	Dropped kerbs	TBC	Decision required
2	Grass verge / footpath between Stockwood Road and Goslet Road, Stockwood	Series of bollards and fence	TBC	Decision required
3	Grass verge / Footpath at Charter Walk (between Great Hayles Road and Miles Walk), Hengrove	Series of bollards	TBC	Decision required
4	Tibbot Road / Sturminster Rd, Stockwood	Dropped kerbs	TBC	Decision required

### Equalities impact assessment

5. An Equalities Impact Relevance Check has been undertaken and determined that due to the fact that this decision has no impact on those with protected characteristics in the following ways a full equalities impact assessment is not required:
- access to or participation in a service;
  - levels of representation in BCC workforce; or
  - reducing quality of life (i.e. health, education, standard of living)
6. Further Equalities Impact Relevance Checks will be undertaken during the development of each scheme so that the specific impact of that scheme can be considered as the detail evolves.